



Teacher Education Reports

Volume 7 Number 21

November 7, 1985

new articles etc

WASHINGTON FOCUS: The House acted last week to approve a Senate-passed measure reauthorizing the Education for Economic Security Act for another three years. The bill (H.R. 1210), currently awaiting the President's signature, was not expected to win Congressional approval in this session, and members of the House Committee on Appropriations even held off providing money for the Act's Mathematics and Science Education Program, because reauthorization was so iffy. The surprise House action came when that chamber voted to approve a reauthorization of the National Science Foundation and to accept Senate amendments that not only breathed new life into math/science initiatives but into the Magnet Schools Assistance Program. According to Irene Forde-Howard of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Congress agreed to authorize a total of \$400 million annually for the Department of Education's math and science programs, with \$350 million going to the Title II state grant programs (see related story, p. 5), and the balance earmarked for the Discretionary Partnership Program authorized under Title III. (See Teacher Education Reports, Aug. 1) The Partnership Program, which was previously under NSF and which has never been funded, is unlikely however to receive any money in the coming fiscal year, and Title II programs are currently budgeted to be given \$90 million under the Senate's spending bill for the Department of Education. In approving H.R. 1210, Congress agreed to fund magnet schools at the fiscal 1985 level of \$75 million, and with virtually no debate it struck out the highly controversial prohibition against the use of magnet schools money for the teaching of secular humanism.

MAJOR STORIES IN THIS ISSUE

New Coalition Puts Focus on
Thinking-Skills-Instruction . . . 4

ED Publishes Final Rules for
Math, Science Grant Program . . . 5

Attack on Holmes Group Highlights
Rifts Among Teaching Reformers . . . 6

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW: American Federation of Teachers President
Albert Shanker 1

SHANKER URGES INCREASED INCENTIVES, HIGHER STANDARDS FOR TEACHING PROFESSION

In this third part of an exclusive three-part interview with Teacher Education Reports Publisher Emily Feistritzer, American Federation of Teachers President Albert Shanker talks about the need for incentives and standards within the teaching profession and outlines his own ideal model for training and certifying teachers.

Q. SOME OF US DO FEEL VERY STRONGLY THAT THE BIGGEST PROBLEM IN TEACHING IS NOT SALARIES. IT'S NOT EVEN NUMBERS. IT'S THE STANDARDS ISSUE. THAT NOT HAVING STANDARDS AND NOT HAVING HIGH STANDARDS AND HAVING RATHER RIDICULOUS MEANS BY WHICH A TEACHER GETS EDUCATED AND CERTIFIED IS A MAJOR TURNOFF TO A LOT OF POTENTIAL TEACHERS. WHAT'S YOUR OPINION ON THAT?

I agree. I think that what you need.... In order to get the people and keep the people that you need, what you need are incentives to stay. And the incentives to stay have to be greater than the incentives to leave. Now salary is an incentive. But there are many jobs that don't pay high salaries but where the people are willing to stay, because there are other incentives. Suppose that there were substantial opportunities to continue study with some sort of assistance. Suppose that you had a very effective sabbatical program where you said to people that every seven years you get a semester off and you can live a life which will be different from that which you will live in industry or anywhere else because you can see the world. Being a part of management in your institution and being given a status and the ability to make decisions. A lot of people take a smaller amount of money, because they're the boss or the manager and they're not subject to a lot of pettiness from other people. Or at least they're partners and they buy in. And these incentives are very, very normal. People study them in business schools. We can look out there at the world and look at different occupations and professions and of course the poorer the other incentives are, the more you have to give higher salaries. If it's a dirty, lousy job in which you're mistreated, then you have to pay people well. On the other hand, if you're treated very well in other ways, you can pay less when it comes to salary.

I think it's very unfortunate that we don't think of it as an overall incentive package -- the whole question of that you decide what your standard is and then you analyze different types of incentives. And the only question is what package of incentives will be powerful enough to keep teachers of the caliber that you want here. Now part of that is that the incentives also change depending on the community you're working in and the difficulty of working with a particular student. It's one thing on the incentive package if you have a group of very well-behaved, highly-motivated students who are being pushed at home, and therefore the teachers get a tremendous amount of intrinsic satisfaction from the job, because the kids are making it and that teacher can have a feeling of very great success. The incentives you need there would be very different from the powerful set of incentives you'd need in the inner-city where the supports are not that great and where the intrinsic satisfaction is not always that great and where the difficulties are much more. These are the things that need discussion.

Q. IN AN IDEAL WORLD IF YOU COULD DESCRIBE WHAT YOU THINK IS THE BEST WAY TO GET TEACHERS EDUCATED AND CERTIFIED, WHAT WOULD THAT MODEL LOOK LIKE?

I'm a very strong believer in what people who are very highly educated in their own field or broadly educated in the liberal arts in the case of elementary school teachers and even the case of high school teachers -- I would take bright liberal arts graduates in traditional majors and minors, and I would probably -- for those who want to become teachers -- hope that they would have a series of experiences, maybe even starting in their high school years but going through college with youngsters in other settings. For instance summer camps, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, boys' clubs or perhaps even assisting in tutorial programs. I'm a very strong believer in using youngsters who are older to tutor youngsters who are younger. I think it

helps both. Then I would have two other elements. I would probably have these people work in the schools for perhaps a year as apprentice teachers or as assistant teachers -- not with full responsibility -- in order for them to become acquainted with what happens in schools, what are the problems there. Because I think that professional education is not very meaningful unless you've actually had some experience in schools. It just sounds like a lot of theory. It is if you have not had any experience, because the only thing you can do is think back to your own childhood in school and that's not very good. It's not the same as having an adult role.

Then I would have a block of professional courses based on the research to date. For example I think that A Nation of Readers is a good example of pulling together what is known. I think the same could be done in a number of other areas. And then I think that we could put together a program that would last a year, and that would be a firm foundation in what the research stage is. And I think that you need an internship which is a heavily supervised entry for two or three years where you could try out different teaching styles, observe other teachers, prepare different types of programs. And where a real decision is made on whether you belong in teaching or not. Don't wait until somebody's been around for 15 years to decide that they were never any good.

Q. YOU'RE IN FAVOR OF THE NATIONAL EXAM. AT WHAT STAGE WOULD PEOPLE TAKE THAT?

I would probably do that after college graduation. It could be as they come in to intern, and to make sure that they're eligible to continue further in the field.

Q. RIGHT NOW EACH STATE HAS ITS OWN CRITERIA FOR CERTIFICATION. DO YOU THINK IT WOULD BE DESIRABLE TO NATIONALIZE SOME OF THE STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION?

I do. But I don't think the federal government can or should do it, and that's why I favor a national examination. Because a national examination, if it were complex enough -- not one of these quicky things, but something based on knowledge and professional matter and if the internship were part of it -- that would drive the certification standards.

Q. WHAT KIND OF TIME-LINE DO YOU SEE FOR THIS NATIONAL EXAM AND NATIONAL STANDARDS COMING TO PASS?

I'd say three or four years to have it out there and available and to have some states buying in and moving towards it. If you asked me what the time-line is for having the 50 states accept it, that would be a lot longer. I don't think it's so important to have the 50 states, if you get a critical mass where there would be like a bar exam or other professional exam, then most states would feel they'd have to adopt it or have to go with it or else the people in their state would know that they were sacrificing some very important quality value.

Q. THERE OBVIOUSLY IS A LOT OF CONCERN ABOUT TEACHING IN PEOPLE'S MINDS. IF YOU HAD TO PICK ONE NUMBER ONE PRIORITY CONCERNING TEACHING TODAY, WHAT WOULD IT BE? WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE MOST URGENT, CRUCIAL ISSUE THAT NEEDS IMMEDIATE ATTENTION?

I think the crucial issue is the structural change. There's almost complete agreement on salaries, standards, curriculum, on all sorts of things. The thing is that no one has created a picture of a model that would

make it happen. Well what we're talking about here are dreams. Dreams that are largely unrealizable.

Q. WELL HAVING DIFFERENT KINDS OF TEACHERS COMING INTO THE PROFESSION THROUGH DIFFERENT CERTIFICATION ROUTES IS NOT A PIPE DREAM.

It's not a pipe dream, but it doesn't get you too many people of the caliber that you want. It's a competitive world out there. IBM, everybody else wants their fair share of talented people. ... People who write, people who think, people who do PR. We're asking for something that no other field does. Every other field has some kind... Every other field if you want high-quality people, they have fewer people doing the essence of it. The essence in education is teaching -- not the custodial function.

Q. DON'T YOU THINK THAT PEOPLE AT THE SCHOOL DISTRICT LEVEL, THE SCHOOL BUILDING LEVEL ARE OPEN TO HIRING PEOPLE AT MINIMUM WAGE TO WATCH CAFETERIAS AND BUSES? OR EVEN HIRE TEACHERS AT DIFFERENT LEVELS AND GIVE THEM DIFFERENT RESPONSIBILITIES? DO YOU REALLY THINK THAT WE'RE NOT READY FOR THAT IN SCHOOLS?

We're not ready for it. And we're not ready for it, because we're still thinking of a classroom with 30 or 35 kids and a teacher standing in front of it. As long as that's the model, then you want every one of those classrooms to have a teacher that is good. So therefore you create the model in which you need 2 million or 2.3 million people of a certain caliber, and when you can't get them then you just lower the standards or have people teach out of field. And that's what you've got, and that's about to get worse rather than better. But why do you have to have 30 or 35 people sitting there with one teacher lecturing to kids who are bored and falling asleep...?

NEW COALITION SEEKS MAJOR UPGRADING
OF THINKING SKILLS INSTRUCTION

More than 20 leading educational organizations have banded together in a new Collaborative on Teaching Thinking with the overriding goal of effecting a systemwide upgrading of thinking skills instruction in the nation's schools.

The new initiative, announced earlier this month by Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) President Carolyn Hughes, enjoys the support of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the National Education Association (NEA) and a host of other groups that represent academic societies, administrators, colleges, parents and interested citizens.

The coalition, which is expected to expand, is seeking to ensure that academic content is taught in ways that develop and encourage student thinking, and it is dedicated to the explicit teaching of necessary cognitive skills -- an aim less well established in the nation's schools.

Citing critical need as demonstrated by student performance on tests of higher-order thinking ability, Hughes sees thinking skills teaching as a major challenge in which ASCD -- among others -- is investing maximum and immediate effort. In making the announcement she also acknowledged major contributions in the area by the National Council of Social Studies, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the National Council of Teachers of English.

In addition AFT chief Albert Shanker announced earlier this year that development of critical thinking skills among students and teachers is now a

top priority, and he unveiled plans for an ambitious Critical Thinking Project. (See Teacher Education Reports, July 18) Meanwhile the NEA is moving forward briskly with its own initiatives in the area.

To achieve its goals the Collaborative outlined five tasks to be accomplished by teams to be formed with members of the 23 cooperating organizations:

- Define terms, definitions and processes relating to thinking skills and useful to curriculum planners;
- Change and improve preservice and inservice teacher education in teaching thinking;
- Design materials that will contribute to better student thinking by working with publishers of textbooks and tests;
- Escalate research in human thinking and the effectiveness of approaches and materials used to teach thinking, and
- Promote the need and value of such programs to gain public support.

The Collaborative noted that surveys show that a few schools now offer separate courses in thinking, but many are seeking ways to enhance thinking skills instruction within regular classes.

"Either way," a statement issued by the Collaborative noted, "the idea is not to teach thinking instead of content, but to teach students the intellectual skills they need in order to learn and make use of knowledge"

ED ISSUES FINAL RULES FOR MATH, SCIENCE STATE GRANT PROGRAM

The Department of Education announced last week the final regulations for the new state grants program aimed at improving the teaching of mathematics, science, computer learning and foreign languages and at enhancing student access to such upgraded instruction.

Under the \$100 million program, which is authorized under Title II of the Education for Economic Security Act of 1984, about \$63 million will be used for elementary and secondary education, about \$27 million for higher education, and an estimated \$10 million will go for the Secretary's Discretionary Grant Program, which is governed by separate rules issued earlier this year. (See Teacher Education Reports, July 18 and Sept. 26)

According to the regulations, which were published in the October 25 Federal Register, Education Secretary William J. Bennett will determine the grant amounts based on each state's population aged five to 17, as compared with the total number of children in all states. From those funds the states are eligible to receive, 70 percent will be awarded for use in conducting programs at the elementary and secondary levels, with the remaining 30 percent going for postsecondary programs.

The Department said that state grants to LEAs are to be used for expansion and improvement of inservice training and retraining of teachers and other personnel in the areas of math and science and that teachers who use these subjects in vocational education courses will also be considered.

Only after meeting all mathematics and science needs may LEAs use any remaining funds for computer learning and instruction, foreign language instruction, and instructional materials and equipment related to math and science.

The new regulations also provide that state grants awarded to institutions of higher education on a competitive basis are to be used for:

- Retraining secondary school teachers in other disciplines to specialize in the teaching of math, science or computer learning;
- Inservice training for elementary, secondary and vocational teachers to improve their skills in the abovementioned subject areas, and
- Traineeship programs for new mathematics and science teachers at the secondary school level.

Under the new rules, state education agencies are authorized to use part of their Title II funds for exemplary programs, the dissemination of information about those programs, and for providing technical assistance, program evaluation and administrative services.

State higher education agencies may use part of their grants for cooperative activities between institutions of higher education and local and state education agencies, private industry and nonprofit organizations.

Title II rules also include provisions for assuring the equitable participation of public and private schools and postsecondary institutions, and they require that some priority be given to activities that assure greater access by students from historically underrepresented and underserved groups, and gifted and talented students.

(For further information about the new rules for Title II state grants, contact: Dr. Allen Schmeider, Chief, Mat/Science Section, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., (Rm. 2011 - FOB #6, Mail Stop 6264), Washington, D.C. 20202. Phone: (202) 755-0410.)

HOLMES GROUP CONTROVERSY BARES CONFLICTS WITHIN PROFESSION AND AACTE

Teaching reform is unquestionably high on just about everyone's education agenda, but the distinct lack of agreement both among and within the various groups and organizations working to achieve change erupted into a public controversy last month when a candidate for the presidency of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) lashed out vociferously at the Holmes Group Consortium of reform-minded education deans.

Dr. Hendrick Gideonse, dean of the college of education at the University of Cincinnati and a candidate for president-elect of AACTE, took the Holmes Group to task in an October 9 letter to the Association's membership in which he questioned not the deans' aims and proposals but their method of operation.

He wrote in part that "serious contradictions" exist "between the espoused aims of the Holmes Group and the values manifest in actions taken in the Group's behalf." The Consortium, which first began meeting two years ago, is composed of deans from the nation's leading research universities, and it

is working to develop a comprehensive strategy for upgrading the ways we train our teachers. (See Teacher Education Reports, June 6)

Gideonse said in an interview that he did not regret writing the letter which fulfilled his expectation of "creating considerable discussion," but he added that he thinks it "sank" his chances of winning the AACTE leadership post. Gideonse's opponent Dr. William Gardner, dean of the College of Education at the University of Minnesota, refused to comment on the matter as did AACTE Executive Director David Imig.

But while Gideonse termed the refusals "absolutely appropriate" under the circumstances, the new controversy highlights not only dissension within the ranks of the teaching profession as a whole, but points to internal conflict within AACTE which many perceive as the appropriate organizational vehicle for developing and implementing reforms.

Gideonse said that he was prompted to write the highly critical letter after attending an October 6 conference of education deans from state universities and land-grant colleges. At that time, he stated, the group received a briefing on the Holmes Group's activities, but that briefing failed to address many of the issues which "were being discussed in the hallways" as matters of serious concern.

Specifically rankling Gideonse and others were widespread rumors that some Holmes Group members "were chosen for reasons of politics and friendship," and the perception that the Consortium -- despite assertions to the contrary -- was critical of AACTE and of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Gideonse also told Teacher Education Reports that there exists a "strong feeling of exclusion among those not part of the Consortium" which is made even stronger because "people don't know how to become part of it if they want to."

He added, "The enterprise is a major intervention into the policy and structure of teacher education, and the issues being examined are fundamental issues for AACTE and for NCATE to address."

Gideonse acknowledged that AACTE "is not dealing any more effectively than any other group" with the issues at hand. He declared, "They have far to go, but have made progress particularly through the strengthening of NCATE."

He added, "Diversity of opinion contributes to richness, but if it can't be brought together it means weakness. AACTE needs to bring this all together."

Reaction by the Holmes Group members to the letter has been mixed. Dr. Judith Lanier, the Group's chair and dean of the College of Education at Michigan State University, was not available for comment but has reportedly been opting to downplay the entire controversy.

Other members have been more outspoken however. For example Gary Griffin, dean of the College of Education at the University of Illinois/Chicago wrote his own letter in which he decried Gideonse's "dramatic portrait of the group as a subversive, divisive cabal of persons who have as a guiding principle an exclusionary basis." Conversely John Palmer, dean of the College of Education at the University of Wisconsin, would say only, "As an individual Dr. Gideonse has a right to his views and opinions."

RESOURCES

MEETINGS

National Council of States on Inservice Education (NCSIE) -- November 22-26; Denver, Colo. Theme: "On Being #1: Developing a Climate for Reform in Education." This is NCSIE's Tenth Annual National Staff Development Conference. For information: National Council of States on Inservice Education, Syracuse University School of Education, 150 Marshall St., 402 Huntington Hall, Syracuse, N.Y. 13210. Phone: (315) 423-4167.

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) -- November 22-27; Philadelphia, Pa. Theme: "Listening to the Past, Speaking to the Present." This is NCTE's annual meeting. For information: Robert Harvey, Convention Director, National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Ill. 61801. Phone: (217) 238-3870.

PUBLICATIONS

Reading, Thinking and Concept Development: Strategies for the Classroom, edited by Theodore L. Harris and Eric J. Cooper, is a recently published, 280-page book containing a collection of 15 articles by some of the nation's leading educators who approach teaching of reading as thinking and who present the thesis that reading for comprehension and thinking is an integrated process that all students must master. To order: College Board Publications, Box 886, New York, N.Y. 10101. Order No. 022199. Cost: \$19.95.

Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking, edited by Arthur L. Costa, is a just published, comprehensive report on the teaching of thinking that includes detailed information on teaching strategies aimed at developing student thinking and on existing programs for the teaching of thinking. To order: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Publications Division, 225 North Washington St., Alexandria, Va. 22314. ASCD Stock # 611-85362. Cost: \$19.95.

Wordplay and Language Learning for Children by Linda Gibson Geller is a just published book that says teachers should recognize children's chants, jingles, riddles, etc. as important aids in teaching reading and writing and that analyzes the kinds of wordplay teachers can use in class to support the language abilities they are trying to teach. To order: National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Ill. 61801. Phone: (217) 328-3870. Stock # 58218-015. Cost: \$9.75. (For NCTE members, \$7.50).

Feistritzer Publications

Publisher: C. Emily Feistritzer

Editor: Kathleen C. Price

Editorial Offices: 1901 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 707, Washington, D.C. 20006

Use this form to subscribe to or renew

Teacher Education Reports

Mail to: 1901 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 707, Washington, D.C. 20006

I'd like to subscribe for:

one year (24 issues) — \$127

two years — \$233

Renew my subscription for:

one year

two years

Payment enclosed

Bill me

Name _____

Title _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____

Zip _____